Amendment Dated September 20, 2010 Reply to Office Action of May 21, 2010

## **Remarks/Arguments:**

The present invention relates to an accumulation display device as a main display device and a mobile data terminal as a sub-display device. Highlights or replays of various scenes of a program currently viewed on the accumulation display device can be viewed on the mobile data terminal.

Claims 1, 6, 16 and 18 have been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claims 1-6 and 9-18 are pending.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being patentable over Schrader et al. (US 2002/0166123, referred to herein as Schrader) in view of Nejime et al. (US 7,272,843, referred to herein as Nejime). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, as amended, includes features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

... <u>a main display unit</u> receiving and displaying the input of the program content received by the reception unit ...

... an accumulated image processing unit <u>connected with a</u> mobile data terminal functioning as a sub reception and display unit ...

... the accumulated image processing unit further extracts at least a part of the program content from the index information based on contents of the trigger information, restructures the program content extracted ... outputs the restructured program content to the mobile data terminal, and <u>displays the restructured program content on the mobile data terminal in a manner that the currently broadcasted original program content received by the reception unit is displayed in parallel on the main display unit. (emphasis added)</u>

Amendment Dated September 20, 2010 Reply to Office Action of May 21, 2010

Applicants' claimed accumulation display device includes a main display unit which displays the input of program content and a mobile data terminal functioning as a sub reception and display unit connected with the accumulation display device via an accumulated image processing unit. The accumulated image processing unit extracts at least a part of the program content based on trigger information, restructures the extracted program content based on mode information and outputs the restructured program content to the mobile data terminal. According to Applicants' claim 1, the restructured program content is displayed on the mobile data terminal such that the currently broadcasted original program content is displayed in parallel on the main display unit.

In Applicants' claimed invention, the accumulation display device (the main display unit) and the mobile data terminal (the sub display unit) are connected such that they are in communication with each other. Accordingly, when trigger information and index information are received (in addition to currently broadcasted program content), the program content is displayed on the accumulation display device (the main display unit) and restructured program content (based on mode information included in the trigger information) is displayed on the mobile data terminal (the sub display unit). In other words, in Applicants' claimed invention, a parallel display is performed between the accumulation display device (the main display unit) and the mobile data terminal (the sub display unit).

Schrader relates to enhanced television services for digital video recording and playback. (Abstract.) Schrader teaches that enhanced IP content may be provided to client systems in a dedicated data communication channel. As shown in Fig. 3, the enhanced IP data includes associated identification data or data associated with a particular television program, such as user interface data 326, trigger data 330, alert data 332 and event ID 334. The enhanced IP content may be used to create an enhanced navigation tool as well as an enhanced television schedule. The IP data may be augmented before it is routed to the client system, to create various real-time tunable alerts, triggers or filters. The client system processes the data to create real-time visual indicators and cues together with the IP data. (Paragraphs [0041-0047])

Nejime relates to a broadcasting method and broadcast signal receiver apparatus where auxiliary information for supplementing broadcast information can be viewed by the viewer. (Abstract) Nejime discloses, in Fig. 3, a data format of broadcast information 201, where a plurality of program indices 203 are inserted between pieces of video/audio data in each

Amendment Dated September 20, 2010 Reply to Office Action of May 21, 2010

program. Program index 203 includes information such as a program ID, a start time, and end time and one or more auxiliary information IDs for identifying auxiliary information to be interlocked during an operation to play back the program. (Column 5, line 57-Column 6, line 41.)

None of the cited art, however, disclose or suggest an accumulation display device including a main display unit connected with a mobile data terminal functioning as a sub reception and display unit (via an accumulated image processing unit), as required by claim 1. The cited art are silent regarding any connection of an accumulation display device (a main display unit) and a mobile data terminal (a sub display unit). Accordingly, none of the cited art can teach, either alone or in combination, that an accumulated image processing unit outputs and displays restructured program content on the mobile data terminal such that the currently broadcasted original program content is displayed in parallel on the main display unit, as required by claim 1. The cited art are silent regarding these features.

As discussed above, according to Applicants' claimed invention, a parallel display is performed between the accumulation display device (the main display unit) and the mobile data terminal (the sub display unit). In contrast, in the cited art, when trigger information and index information are received (in addition to currently broadcasted program content), the display of the currently broadcasted program content has to be cut or stopped, before a restructured program content can be displayed. Thus, the cited art, either alone or in combination, do not include all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 3 include all of the features of claim 1 from which they depend.

Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over the cited art by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Shteyn (US 2002/0144007). Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Shteyn in further view of Kinno et al. (US 2003/0154217, referred to herein as Kinno). Claims 9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Kinno in further view of Gardere et al. (US 6,678,332, referred to herein as Gardere) in further view of Zander et al. (US 6,360,218, referred to herein as Zander). Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

Amendment Dated September 20, 2010 Reply to Office Action of May 21, 2010

103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Shteyn in further view of Kinno in further view of Gardere. Claims 12 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Kinno et al. in further view of Munetsugu et al. (US 7,134,074, referred to herein as Munetsugu). Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Hoshino et al. (US 2004/0249861, referred to herein as Hoshino) in further view of Munetsugu. These claims, however, include all of the features of claim 1 from which they depend. Accordingly, claims 2-6 and 9-15 are patentable over the cited art by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claims 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Nejime in further view of Sibley et al. (US 7,302,224, referred to herein as Sibley) in further view of Shteyn in further view of Kinno. Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Shteyn in further view of Kinno. It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 16 and 18, although not identical to claim 1, include features similar to claim 1 that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, allowance of claims 16 and 18 is respectfully requested for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 17 is patentable by virtue of its dependency on allowable claim 16.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

4

spectfully sybmitted

Attorney for Applicants

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515

LEA/dmw

Dated: September 20, 2010

P.O. Box 980 Valley Forge, PA 19482 (610) 407-0700

Page 12 of 12